REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Action dated March 9, 2005. In order to advance prosecution of the present Application, Claims 1, 9, 18, and 22 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action for this Application.

The Examiner issued a Final Action on March 9, 2005. Applicant submitted a Response to Examiner's Final Action on May 9, 2005. The Examiner issued an Advisory Action on June 27, 2005 stating that the Response to Examiner's Final Action would not be entered because it raised new issues requiring further searching and consideration. Applicant respectfully requests continued examination of this Application so that the Response to Examiner's Final Action be entered and considered by the Examiner pursuant to this Request for Continued Examination. For the convenience of the Examiner, the amendments made to the claims in the Response to Examiner's Final Action and the accompanying comments are repeated herein.

Claims 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Barroso, et al. Independent Claim 18 recites ". . . a resource manager operable to invalidate outdated data from the local cache to maintain coherence with the processor memory without receiving an invalidation message." By contrast, the Barroso, et al. application only discloses invalidating data when the data has changed and not when it is outdated as provided in the claimed invention. Further, the Barroso, et al. application requires the use of invalidation messages in order to invalidate data. Support for the above recitation can be found at page 16, lines 12-19, of Applicant's specification. Therefore, Applicant

respectfully submits that Claims 18-20 are not anticipated by the Barroso, et al. application.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-13, 15, 16, and 21-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barroso, et al. in view of Bourne, et al. Independent Claims 1, 9, and 22 recite in general the ability to invalidate the data at the I/O interfaces upon expiration of a time interval and identify the data as free in the processor memory system upon expiration of the time interval without sending any invalidation messages. By contrast, the Barroso, et al. application merely maintains coherence whenever data is changed and not through a timed access technique as provided in the claimed invention. To support the deficiencies of the Barroso, et al. patent, the Examiner cites the Bourne, et al. application for its association of a time limit with a fragment in a cache. However, the Bourne, et al. application does not disclose a coherence domain that includes I/O interfaces and requires the use of invalidating messages to invalidate data in caches. Thus, the structure proposed by the Examiner of placing the time limit for a cache fragment technique of the Bourne, et al. application into the scalable architecture of the Barroso, et al. application would still lack an ability to invalidate data in I/O caches in a coherence domain and identify data as free in memory upon expiration of a time interval without using invalidation messages as required in the claimed invention. Support for the above recitation can be found at page 16, lines 12-19, of Applicant's specification. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-13, 15, 16, and 21-25 are patentably distinct from the proposed Barroso, et al. - Bourne, et al. combination.

Claims 5 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barroso, et al. in view of Bourne, et al. and further in view of Culler, et al. Independent Claim 1, from which Claim 5 depends, and Independent Claim 9, from which Claim 14 depends, have been shown above to be patentably distinct from the proposed Barroso, et al. - Bourne, et al. combination. Moreover, the Culler, et al. paper does not disclose any additional material combinable with either the Barroso, et al. or Bourne, et al. applications that would be material to patentability of these claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 5 and 14 are patentably distinct from the proposed Barroso, et al. - Bourne, et al. - Culler, et al. combination.

Claims 8 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barroso, et al. in view of Bourne, et al. and further in view of Sharma, et al. Independent Claim 1, from which Claim 8 depends, and Independent Claim 9, from which Claim 17 depends, have been shown above to be patentably distinct from the proposed Barroso, et al. - Bourne, et al. combination. Moreover, the Sharma, et al. patent does not disclose any additional material combinable with either the Barroso, et al. or Bourne, et al. applications that would be material to patentability of these claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 8 and 17 are patentably distinct from the proposed Barroso, et al. - Bourne, et al. - Sharma, et al. combination.

Attached herewith is a check in an amount of $790.00 made payable to the "Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks" to satisfy the request for continued examination fee of 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e).

Applicant respectfully requests a one month extension of time for filing this Request for Continued Examination. Attached herewith is a Notification of Extension of Time with check in support thereof.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place the Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0378 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicant

Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

July 7, 2005

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, TX 75201-2980

(214) 953-6507

Customer Number: 05073